G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

Q.H. 401-16 & 22-24 & 60
1920.-21
F.I. 108-17 & 6-8
Q.I. 190-19 & 162. (Q.I.)

File No. 57-20

Serial Nos 4 & 5

Later references.

Cons-no-1,34-

Returned
25.11.43

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 4 & 5

Part B for December 1920

SUBJECT.

Proposal to enhance the pay of the Abdul Khadir & Raja weavers under Heree: Proto: To Rs100/- during the remaining period of their service

---

Ac do the Councils
C.No.C: 4130 of 25-12-20
Advised that the enhanced pay of Rs 100/- to Messrs Abdul Khadir & Raja weavers under Heree from the date of Q-O

WD 2238—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

20/12/20

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

( )

NOTES.

File No. 59-24

FILE HEADING.

The question of enhancement of the pay of Accounts probationers.

From

The Comptr.

No. R.684 Dated 6th NOV. 20 Received 8.11.20

Diary No. 2252	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No. 4

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Re the representation of Mir. M. Abdul Khader, Accounts probationer & recommending grant of an enhanced pay of Rs 100/- to him with effect from 1st NOV. 20

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Submd. for orders with references.

MKR
13.11.

As Mr. Abdul Khader himself admits, his case is not quite similar to that of the 3 probationers. Who were

NOTES—First Sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | G.F File No. 59 of 19 20.

Serial No.

proof under the terms of clause V of para 3 of G.O. of 2nd Jan 1917 in the special circumstances of the case. It is true that in sanctioning the increase in the case the recommendation of H.E. Dalla that the accumulated probations applied under his scheme should form a bar to Brohi was also taken into consideration.

2) The pay and prospects of Mr. M. Ab. Jal Khan, like others have been affected by the terms of the order of appointment, and in the view the increase asked for is not admissible, unless there are any grounds for exceptional treatment. If such grounds are considered exist in the present case any initial pay of Rs 150 may be given.

Yes 185/22/11

Yes
19.11.20

3, The arguments advanced by the applicant are not quite

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

G. S. File No. 59 of 19 20.

Serial No.

Ebiong. In the reorganisation of the Comptr's office sanctioned by the recommendation of Mr Datta provision is made for 2 Probationary Supts on Rs 100 each and these places are now held by messrs Venkataramana Iyengar and Mahabalarao the other 2 probationers. There is another Probationer Mr Rajamannar Naidu & he is getting only Rs 75. If Mr Abdul Kadir's request is granted the pay of Mr Rajamannar Naidu also will have to be raised.

4) In these circs it seems to me that the applicants' request may be considered after the results of the Exams for which he has to sit are known.

5) As a mahomedan Graduate Mr Abdul Kadir deserves consideration but any shown to him will have to be extended to Mr Rajamannar Naidu also. He has to consider these cases after their performance in the Departmental Exs is known.

6) I am not quite sure whether the Dewan would consider the case of Mr Abdul Kadir favourably. If we do object to the transfer, there is no objection to treating Mr Abdul Kadir as officiating Supt for 3 or 5 years.

DEWAN'S OFFICE. Recd. on NOV 29 1920 No. 3933

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 59 of 1920.

Serial No.

[illegible] Refusing [illegible] request [illegible] removing [illegible] Cases. Objection [illegible] on [illegible] commencement, [illegible] had refused [illegible] request [illegible] Mahabaleshwar [illegible] Vanketrao [illegible] [illegible] Agency [illegible] not [illegible] Civil. [illegible] did [illegible] not [illegible] [illegible] Protection, [illegible] Resi[illegible] [illegible] also [illegible] for [illegible] Concession [illegible] [illegible]. It [illegible] [illegible] fair treatment [illegible] removing [illegible] Protection [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible] Compositor [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

5

Submitted to His Highness.

***

A

13/ In Government Order No.Fl.6596/G-F.108-17-8 dated the 7th May 1918 an enhanced pay of Rs.100 was granted to Messrs. H.V. Venkataramaiengar and D. Mahabala Rao, Account Probationers of the first batch during the period of their probation.

B

14/ 2. A similar concession was extended to Mr. C. Rajagopala Rao, Probationer attached to the Railway Audit Office from the 1st January 1920.

U

5/ 3. On a representation made by Mr. Abdul Khadar, Account Probationer of the Second batch, the Comptroller has recommended that the concession granted to the above three probationers may be shown to him also from the 1st November 1920.

1 & its enclosure

16/ 4. The proposal of the Comptroller is reasonable, and as the case of Mr. Rajamannar Naidu, the other probationer is similar, both he and Mr. M. Abdul Khadar may be allowed a pay of Rs.100 each during the remaining period of their probation.

Ramachandra Iyer

18th Dec. 1920

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders of His Highness the Maharaja.

Subject.

Proposal to enhance the pay of Messrs. M. Abdul Khader and Rajamannar Naidu, Account Probationers, to Rs.100 during the remaining period of their probation.

702

17/ *Order.*

~~KRW~~

22/12/20

18/ N. Ly

23.12.20

19/ Issue orders accordingly

23/12/20

59

7

R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 59 of 1917.

Serial No. 5

To

The comptr

H 4130 dy 25-12-20.

Sanction the enhanced pay of Rs 100 to messrs Abdul Khadar and Rajamannar Naidu from the date of the G. O.

11-1-21

Under Secy

8

Please address all future communications to the Comptroller to the Govt. of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.
In reply to this Comn. please refer to
No. R.648.C/-1

REV. SEC'T
Fin Secy
NOV 1920

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Dated, Bangalore, the 6th Novr 1920.

DIARY No. 2982

FROM

23630 R/8/20

T.Satyaraj Chetty, Esq., B.A.,
~~M. N. KRISHNA RAO, ESQ., B.A.,~~
~~Offg.~~ *Comptroller to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

1920 – 1921
Section. G7
59-20
Serial No. 4

To

M. N. Krishna Rao, ESQ., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Financial *Department.*

SIR,

I have the honour to forward herewith the representation received from Mr.M.Abdul Khader, Account probationer, attached to this office praying that he may be allowed an increased rate of pay during the period of his probation. He has now been drawing a pay of Rs.75/- per mensem in accordance with the Government Order appointing him as a Probationer. He claims that the pay of Rs.100/- which has been sanctioned to ~~those~~ three of the probationers, viz., Messrs H.V.Venkatramiengar, D.Mahabala Rao and Rajagopal Rao may be sanctioned to him also.

In para 24 of Mr.Datta's notes on the reorganisation of this office a pay of Rs.100/- has been proposed for the probationers of the Account Department. I therefore, request that in the circumstances of the case referred to in the Probationer's representation a pay of Rs.100 - may be sanctioned to Mr.Mahomed Abdul Khader with effect from 1st November 1920.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
T. Satya raj Chetty
Comptroller.

U.

WD.0322—GPB—3,000—14-12-16

C. O. 42–Rec.—17]

....Department

... ... 191

FROM

M. N. KRISHNA RAO, ESQ., B.A.,

Offg. Comptroller to the Govt. of

H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

To

.....ESQ.,

Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,

Dept.

Dated

Despatched

Received

No..... ....

Subject matter.

9

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

THROUGH THE COMPTROLLER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

Sir,

I the undersigned account Probationer most humbly beg to place the following before the benign Government for their sympathetic consideration and favourable disposal.

The Government were pleased to appoint Messrs. H.V. Venkataramiengar and D. Mahabala Rao as Account Probationers of the 1st batch and the humble petitioner and one Mr. C. Rajagopal Rao (Railway Accounts Probationer) in the second batch on the pay prescribed in ~~para~~ para 2 of Government Order No.G.6890-906/G.M.401-16-22 dated 24th November 1917. But a few days after the appointment of the Accounts probationers of the 1st batch their pay during the period of probation was fixed at Rs. 100/- per month. Now, I learn that Mr. Rajagopal Rao, the probationer of my batch was granted the same concession with restrospective effect from 1st January 1920. The rumoured reason for the grant of this concession to all the above mentioned three probationers, was that they were holding a graded - appointment in the Education Department prior to their being taken as probationers and that they would have got their annual increments had they continued to be in that Department. This reason appears to be inapplicable if each case is taken by - itself. For instance Mr. Rajagopal Rao of my batch was getting only Rs. 75/- as a Sub-pro-tem teacher from 25th November 1918 but he is allowed to draw at the rate of Rs. 100/- per mensem from 1st January 1920. Further the probationers who were taken to other Departments from the Education Department have not been shown any such concession. For instance Mr. T. Venkataramgam who was taken as a Revenue Probationer from the Education

10

Department, When he was getting Rs. 95/- in the 75-10-125 grade is given only the pay he was drawing at the time of his appointment as probationer, according to the terms of the Government - Order referred to above viz., Rs. 95/- only. The only strong reason which the Government seem to have ~~been~~ taken into consideration for raising the pay of the forementioned probationers to Rs. 100/- is the suggestion made by Mr Datta in para 24 of his notes on the re-organisation of the Comptroller's office (Vol.II) "that account probationers may be started on a pay of Rs.100/-". As this concession has been shown to the other account probationers I pray that the Government may kindly extend their generosity to me also.

If the change of the pay of the above named account probationers was made on consideration of the pay they would have got if they had continued their service in the Education Department, I may be permitted to state that I had the best chance. For when I was appointed as a probationer, Mahomedan graduates were given Rs. 125/- in the Education Department and there were - enough of vacancies for Mahomedan graduates in that Department. When the Committee for the selection of probationers asked me the reason for preferring a probationer's place on Rs. 75/- to a post carrying a pay of Rs. 125/- in the Education Department I told them that it was the very same reason which the other probationers taken from the Education Department had for leaving that Department; the prospects as a probationer in other Departments appeared to be more favourable than those in the Education Department.

None of the account probationers were promised a pay of Rs. 100/- during the priod of probation either by the Committee or by the Government at the time of appointment. When, however, the Government were pleased to raise the pay of the account - probationers, subsequently, there seems to be no reason why I should not be benefitted by this. If some of the probationers of the same class and of the same Department are given a higher

pay than others during their probationery period the former would naturally be confirmed on a higher pay than the latter, which I believe is not the intention of the Government. If I am not given Rs. 100/- during the period of my probation a wide gulf will be created between the grade of my appointment and that of the other account probationers after confirmation. Hence I pray that the benign Government may kindly give my case a sympathetic consideration and grant my request. If, however, the Government think that I am not fortunate enough to get the benefit of the privileges granted to my fellow probationers I pray that they may kindly transfer me as a probationer in the Revenue or Excise Department for which I had actually applied.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

M.S. Abdul Qadir

Bangalore,
Dated ~~7th~~ 1st Nov. 1920

12

G.R.S. 28]

File No. G.7

Serial No. 55-20
8:5

*Diary No. of letter replied to*_____

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.
( )

191

Date of issue 25/12/20

Signed by Mr. M. V. Krishna Rao.

READ— Letter no. R. 648 a 6 dt. Nov. 20 from the Comptr. forwarding the representation of Smt. Mb. Abdul Khader Sahebs praying for an enhancement of pay of Rs 100/- during

ORDER THEREON.—No. the period of his probation & recommending that the concession prayed for may be sanctioned as has been done in the case of

over.

SUBJECT.

KM 25/12

GPB—50,000—1-12-12

Three other probationers messrs.

H. V. Venkataramiengar, D.

Mahabalarao & Rajagopalarao

order no. [illegible]

Govt. are pleased to

sanction the enhanced pay

of Rs 100/- p.m. to both messrs.

M. Abdul Khader & Rajumanual

Naidu during the period of their

probation with effect from the

date of this order.

14/12/20. Sec'y. 16/12/20

To

The Compt.

MKR
11.12.